

Title, director and release year?

The Corporation is a documentary film from 2003 focusing on corporations, their structures, history and effects on society and culture, directed by Mark Achbar and Jennifer Abbot.

What is the central argument or narrative of the film?

The central narrative of the film centers on corporations in their then current form. The film does not explicitly state the directors'/writers' stance on the issue but it's very clear they are trying to show the negative effects corporations have on most systems they interact with.

How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)

The argument is made and sustained first by showing the history of the personhood of corporations, and then subsequently showing how these "people" do receive special treatment and are not held accountable in the same way that real people are for their wrongdoings. The film is divided into discrete sections addressing a particular topic, each beginning with a title slide with an illustration or animation and a text title.

**What sustainability issues did you spot?
Identify and explain each. (Examples -
Political, Legal, Economic, Technological,
Media, Organizational, Educational,
Behavioral, Cultural, Ecological)**

I would venture to say that all sustainability issues were at least touched on in this film. The corporation is an incredibly powerful and pervasive force in all aspects of our society today, and the film exposes this. It shows the protections for corporations, their lack of social responsibility and sole responsibility to shareholders. It shows the extent of their power in media and political arenas as well.

**What parts of the film did you find most
persuasive and/or compelling?**

The most persuasive parts I thought were the parts where Milton Friedman was juxtaposed next to stories of corporate malpractice and surprising protection for corporations.

**Does the film have emotional appeal to
you? Why? (Use concrete examples from
the film to illustrate.)**

I think the film does have an emotional appeal, as it seeks to get the viewer riled up at the injustices portrayed in the double standards that corporations operate under, and the cutaway interviews contain some doomsday predictions for what corporations will end up doing with the earth and economy. The emotional appeal is subtle but it definitely exists and because it is subtle it is powerful.

Does the film rely more on science or emotion? (How does the film balance the scientific argument and the emotional argument?)

The film relies on both science and emotion. The doomsday predictions and demonstrated injustice may anger viewers but there is a strong showing of facts to make it overall a pretty balanced film, if quite outdated at this point.

Does the film want you to do something? If the film does suggest action, do you think it is a good idea? Will the suggested action help?

It doesn't really appear to be the aim of the film to get you to do anything. It seems the film is about educating viewers as to the power of the modern

corporation and raising awareness as to the dangers of a future completely privatized. The film does mention in passing to vote to change the future, but it doesn't really say how. In the credits, there are some links to places to follow up which could be helpful, but most people probably aren't watching by this point.

Are there other actions that are not suggested that should be taken?

I do wish that the film advocated for some kinds of direct actions against the structures depicted in the film. Michael Moore talks about "driving a truck through the system" and I think they could probably talk about how individuals can emulate this in whatever their place in society is.

What was the target audience for this film? Why?

I think the audience is pretty broad, though I do feel this film is pretty well suited to convince pro-corporation type people that they should seriously be sure about their positions.